



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CONCERNING HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

LAST year I asked one hundred high-school principals and superintendents of schools to give me the results of their experience with high-school teachers, indicating their strong and weak points, as they had occasion to observe them, in the practical work of the schoolroom. Then I went over carefully the records of one thousand inspections of secondary teachers on file in the office of the Accredited Schools Committee of our university. These inspections were made by a number of professors who were thought to be especially competent to do this delicate work; and as their reports determined the standing of the schools and individual teachers in question, every precaution was taken to have them made with care. I have thought it might be of some interest to high-school teachers to learn what their official superiors think about their good and bad points, and the occasion will furnish me an opportunity to add a few comments of my own on the side.

The one hundred principals and superintendents who responded to my inquiry, said, with scarcely an exception, that the chief element of strength in the university-trained instructors, who had given no attention to the principles of teaching, lay in their comparatively broad and accurate grasp of their subjects, and this they all declared was of fundamental importance. The university and normal graduates were compared in this respect, and to the great disadvantage of the latter.

But none of my correspondents dwelt long upon the merits of broad scholarship; they devoted themselves mainly to the shortcomings of these scholarly teachers. The principal faults pointed out are familiar enough to every man engaged in practical school work. The university graduate falls short of complete success in his teaching, mainly because he has no just conception of what a high school ought to accomplish, and when he starts in he has little or no sympathy with the kind of work the high school must do. Speaking generally, he has little appre-

ciation of what should be the right relation of his department to other departments in the high school; his ambition is to push his subject to the front regardless of its comparative value for high-school education, and he often seems pleased if he can crowd out other studies altogether. He has not given five minutes' serious thought to the question of the relative values of studies, and is without any adequate notion of what a good and workable program of studies for the high school should be. He has been thinking, even up to the moment of beginning his teaching, about mastering his physics, or Latin, or algebra, and his mind is a blank on the subject of the needs as a whole of high-school boys and girls.

Many of my correspondents say that they have difficulty with their college-trained teachers, in that they often strenuously insist upon doing special and technical work before their pupils have gained a general view of a subject. An enthusiast in physics wants to spend the whole year on some department of light; the biologist will not teach anything but the frog; the Latinist wants the subjunctive mood set right in the minds of the young classicists, and so it goes. The man from college, the best type of man, has himself long ago passed beyond the general view of his subject, and he has come to feel the importance of going deep into some special problem; he is eager to push toward the frontier and take a look into the unknown country, and, naturally enough, he feels that what is of chief interest to himself ought to be of chief interest to every one else.

Eighty-five of these principals and superintendents mention a third very common defect in high-school teachers. They say they insist upon lecturing to their pupils in a formal way, and that consequently they shoot over their heads. And the lecturer is apt to argue that if he is not followed and appreciated the class is at fault, and so he gives his pupils a good tongue-lashing frequently. It is his business to expound the truth, and the pupils' business to absorb it, and if it does not find lodgment in their thought, why then he can do no more than berate them for it. He does all that can be expected of him when he spreads out wisdom before these callow youth; if they do not drink it down

he is not going to put his finger into their mouths to get them to suckle.

The reports upon one thousand teachers, by our inspectors, designate a half dozen or more grave defects, the one mentioned most frequently being *spiritless* teaching, the causes of which are numerous, but formal text-book work is at the bottom of most of it. Teachers insist upon verbatim rendering of a text, which at best is only partially comprehended. Out of the one thousand teachers, one hundred and thirteen teach in this lifeless way. The pupils see little or no connection between the parts of the subjects they are studying; and, worst of all, what they are trying to appropriate has no connection with the real situations of daily life. These teachers, so far as they have any clear end in view in their work, and many of them have none, are dominated by the aim of formal discipline; their chief ambition is to "develop the mental faculties" of their pupils, and the way of accomplishing this is to require them to learn a text and give it back without addition or subtraction. This sort of work will, moreover, in the opinion of these teachers, such as have an opinion at all, develop habits which will be of great importance in after life—habits of attention, perseverance, long suffering (although the instructor would not call it by this name), and the capacity for doing disagreeable and uninteresting tasks; it will develop contentment with plodding, and docility in the performance of drudgery; and since life is one long struggle in doing things one hates, he had best get used to it good and early. These "common-sense" teachers take the view that Mr. Stelling did in his direction of Tom Tulliver's education; when he discovered the thing Tom hated most, that was what he administered to him in most liberal doses, so as to best "develop his character."

It seems probable that every high-school teacher would be saved some unhappy hours, and would be made a more helpful guide to youth, if he gave a little time to an examination of the dogma of formal discipline before he started out to teach the young idea how to shoot. It does not seem to be an impossible task to get the prospective teacher to realize that he ought to try to teach his subject so that it will explain in a real and vital

way some phase of the pupil's environment, and give him a mastery over it. Elementary teachers have been hearing so much the past decade or longer about formal teaching that their work is being enriched and vitalized everywhere, and the laboratory has saved some high-school teachers, even without their knowing it, from dreary formalism ; but still a large portion of the latter fail because they are satisfied with verbal, mechanical, definition teaching. This is why things move so slowly in the classes of these spiritless teachers. Pupils are "eager to get out of the class at the close of the hour ;" "they seem bored ;" their faces "show lack of intelligence and appreciation ;" they seem ready to "cut up pranks at every opportunity ;" "they make the teacher's life miserable ;" "there is a good deal of nagging going on in these class-rooms all the time." This type of teacher has a hard time herself, and makes things hard for her pupils ; and, most unfortunate of all, she wastes their precious hours, and develops in them a distaste for everything that has to do with school life.

The second fault which our inspectors find most frequently is not entirely different from the first—*narrowness of view*. Teachers go into a great deal of technical detail without leading pupils to an appreciation of their bearing upon the large questions involved. Again, pupils are kept immersed in forms, definitions, rules, and fail to grasp the content ; they do not get into the spirit of the things they study. This defect is noticed more often in the teaching of English literature and foreign language than elsewhere, though it is seen also in history and other studies. In these subjects which are so full of human interest the teacher keeps the pupils plodding along on the dusty road, and never once leads them upon the heights where they can get a view of the landscape lying around. This is the cardinal sin committed by ninety teachers in our lists. Of course, it must be due primarily to the teacher's lack of a broad and genuine appreciation of the subjects she essays to teach. She has herself taken only the snail's view ; she is master of nothing but forms and technicalities. She has dined off the husks of knowledge, and knows not the taste of the real grain. She

regards a language as a body of verbal forms strung together according to rules described in rhetoric and grammar, and she looks upon them as having final value in themselves. So it is not to be expected that she can lead others into a mastery of these symbols merely as the media for the gaining and expression of thought and feeling. History is for her not a story of human life in times ago; it is a glossary of names and a table of dates. Literature for such a teacher is not a portrayal of concrete situations in human life, but it is a drill book in rhetorical and grammatical formulæ. We have found some teachers who have gained a broader view of these things for themselves, but who, when they come to instruct others, abandon it, and give themselves up to rules and forms and dates and names and definitions, and they get their pupils mired in this slough of despond. These are the mechanical, artificial, wooden teachers.

Next in the list of demerits comes inaccurate knowledge, which is found most frequently in the teaching of foreign language and history. One sees teachers who make an effort to give instruction in German, but who have gotten all they know out of a book, and who have never spoken or read a word of it outside of the schoolroom. They have never had serious occasion to use the language; they have never felt the spirit of it; they have never thought at first hand in it, or interpreted thought presented in it; they have never touched the language except in its grosser forms; all the subtle peculiarities that really constitute the personality of the language have escaped them. And with this equipment they attempt to lead others into a mastery of the language—a sad case of the blind leading the blind. Here, as we should expect, teaching attains the acme of artificiality. And, moreover, teachers often do not know intimately even the formal, the mechanical side of the language; they have not been compelled to speak it, except in a parrot like and exhibition sort of way; they have never had to deal with any real and vital situation, where the accurate and ready use of the language was essential to success, so their brains have not become impregnated with it, their tongues have not become shaped to it, and their ears have not become keen in detecting crudities in it.

Anything goes with such a teacher ; for how can he be keen in a situation where keenness has never been required of him, except in a make-believe way ? To know a language one must have had to employ it for serious and consequential purposes ; artificiality and superficiality, which mere text-book work tends to encourage, counts for next to nothing.

One who gets only a teaching knowledge of Greek and German can never lead the young into possession of them in the most effective way. What has not come into one's own life in any important, vital way, can never be taught to others economically and effectively. The teaching relation is always partial and imperfect unless the teacher seeks to impart to the learner knowledge which he has found of value in adjustment to his environments; any other kind of knowledge will be cold, inert, sterile in the teacher's hands. The human mind is so constructed that it will work effectively in those situations only where lack of such efficiency will bring pain ; it will not exert itself to be exact or agile where the results of its efforts are indifferent. So if we would develop in our teachers the capacity to do accurate work in any study we must, in their preparatory training, put them into vital situations, where they will, from hard experience, come to realize the necessity of absolute accuracy ; and this principle holds as well in the teaching of their pupils. The really valuable qualities of mind are never attained by mere formal discipline where there is no life relation between the student and the subject ; it is only when they are used to minister to some vital need that they will be acquired in the most effective way.

Our inspectors frequently report a defect which is regarded as very common and serious by principals and superintendents also. The reports specify eighty teachers who fail to get any work out of their pupils. They "shoot over their heads," using the current phrase. The "teacher is too prominent ;" "she does all the talking ;" "she asks a pupil to solve a problem and then does it herself ;" "she manipulates all the apparatus herself ;" "she draws all the illustrations," etc. The defect in such work is, of course, that pupils are not reacting upon what is presented to them and so are not making it their own. High-

school pupils have not had sufficient experience ordinarily to organize what is offered them in the class-room with systems of thought and conduct already established, unless they actually do for themselves the most of what is done in the class. They cannot fully comprehend an experiment unless they get together and in working order the apparatus to perform it, for otherwise they cannot see how a phenomenon is produced. So to have pupils sit in their seats day after day and look on while the teacher performs experiments to illustrate principles is bad teaching, of course ; and it is bad because pupils cannot ordinarily make their own what is being taught, so that they can organize it into conduct, or so that it explains the phenomena in their environment. The ultimate purpose of teaching physics or any science in the high school is, of course, to enable a pupil to interpret the phenomena which occur outside of school ; he must be able to see back of the infinite variety of happenings in the real world, great laws and principles which really simplify the world, and so give him poise and stability and confidence in the midst of it all. But this end can never be achieved when the pupil is merely an onlooker in the laboratory, and not active in producing phenomena.

On the other hand, some teachers go too far in doing nothing in the class-room on their own initiative, except to question their pupils. They have heard somewhere that self-activity must always be attained in teaching, and that the best teacher does the least ; and they interpret this to mean that the pupil should have nothing done for him, but to be quizzed and exhorted. The rule is made to apply as well to the senior in the high school as to the child beginning his primer. Herein is illustrated the usual result of the learning of a method of teaching as a thing-in-itself, as though it could in some way have substance and validity apart from the principles of mental activity. Teachers who study their art in this way try when they get into any new situation to think what the method says instead of observing the mental processes and products of their pupils and being guided accordingly. A teacher who based his practice upon careful observation of the reactions of his pupils would realize that the



senior in the high school has experiences which will enable him often to apprehend and organize effectively what is presented to him for the first time, so that it is not always necessary that he should be goaded by the question-and-answer prod through everything he is learning; he can dispose of some things as fast as the teacher can give them to him, and there is no time to waste by way of tribute to the god of mechanism. The farther along the scholastic route a pupil gets the greater stock of elementary ideas he becomes possessed of, and the better chance he has of interpreting new ideas and working them into his mental fabric instantly upon their first presentation to him.

A wise teacher would tell his pupils just as much as they could comprehend and just as fast as they could grasp it, because of their experience with similar things in the previous work of the school or in their lives in the world without. But some one may ask how we are to tell when a pupil comprehends unless we quiz him. A true teacher can tell from the thousand subtle signs in eye and body whether what she teaches is finding lodgment in the minds and wills of her pupils. She will attach least importance to the mere verbal reaction of a pupil; he may speak out of the top of his mind, and use symbols that have no content; but the features are a bulletin-board upon which is written plainly to the experienced eye what is happening within. The mechanician must go through the forms, but the genuine teacher fills his mind with the situation before him and adapts himself to it, and flings forms and formulæ to the winds. Artificial and wooden rules which declare that a teacher must never lecture will certainly do as much harm as the opposite sort of thing which leads the teacher to talk all the time. It seems to me, though, that we do not hear enough about the schools making good lecturers of teachers; we have not appraised highly enough the value of a teacher cultivating the power of imparting instruction, in the precise meaning of these terms. A teacher must have made a subject an integral part of his intellectual and volitional self before he can teach it; or, putting it in another way, he must have made those adjustments to the world which he expects to have his pupils make; and

when he has done this he can accomplish something in his teaching if he adds an emotional element to the purely intellectual process of leading his pupil into a knowledge of what he is teaching.

Take, for example, any topic in history ; a genuine teacher would have more than intellectual conceptions in this subject ; he would have an emotional attitude toward every question which could arise. Some things he would approve, others he would disapprove, and a true teacher would help his pupils to interpret facts for their own conduct by his emotional attitude toward them ; and he can best express the results of his experience when he takes some part in a class besides quizzing. He can never arouse the emotional life of his pupils when he simply prods them, and so he cannot so effectively push their ideas over into motor actions. I am aware that much of the pedagogy that is afloat says in its implications if not explicitly that when you get a pupil to see a point it will work out into his conduct, but this is no more than a half truth, if it is really that much. Everyone realizes that there is a vast deal taught in the schools that does not influence the conduct of pupils in the slightest degree ; if they really apprehend the principles that are aimed at they do not strike deep down into the organism and get coupled up with the motives and impulses which are the governors of life. And there is nothing which can bring about this fusion of idea and impulse so readily as the personality of a teacher. If his beliefs have become organized into conduct they will be revealed in many subtle ways through voice and facial expression and manner which will more or less subconsciously be imitated by the learner, and this will tend to incite in him such attitudes as are taken by the teacher.

I am aware that some persons think a teacher has no right to put his own interpretation upon the facts he teaches ; it is said that he must not let the pupil know how he feels about anything. He must be simply an instrument for getting the pupil to learn facts. He must not be in any sense a model to his pupil. He must not give him the benefit of his own experience with the world as it has left an impress upon his emotional life. But this is certainly

an erroneous view of the function of the teacher. In the economy of nature each generation chooses those of its members who have embodied in their own lives the highest ideals of the times, and they have charged them to get these same ideals wrought into the lives of the rising generation. Whatever adjustment the teacher has made and has found of service he will seek by every means in his power to get adopted by those whom he teaches. Of course, in matters in which he is in doubt he will lead his pupil to see the reasons therefor, and leave him free to resolve the doubt by his own experience. But there is much relating to belief and conduct we teach in the schools that we may consider as settled, and our business is to get this embodied in the thought and conduct of the young in the most economical and effective way possible. And the point I want to impress is that this can often be done best by the teacher imparting to the young what he knows, and he must study how he can achieve this most effectively, how he can tell so that his story will be most clearly apprehended and most deeply felt. The teacher who makes up his mind never to tell but to draw everything out of his pupil can never, no matter how skilful he becomes, make much more than half a teacher, especially with older pupils.

Our inspectors report two defects which from my own experience I should assign a more important place than is given in these statistics. Of the one thousand teachers inspected forty "lacked authority." They cannot "command the respect and confidence of their pupils;" "they cannot discipline well;" "their class-rooms are in disorder much of the time;" "pupils follow their own sweet wills;" "the serious work of the school is not the most prominent thing in the minds of the pupils;" "they are bent on mischief;" "they will not apply themselves to their studies, but waste the precious hours in dawdling away their time, or in raising Cain."

These forty teachers could not correct these evils because they lacked self-confidence; they could not show power enough to subdue the spirit of mischief surging up in the bosoms of their pupils; or they were lax in their conception of what should be demanded of pupils; or they had some mannerisms which

operated to their disadvantage. In some cases they lacked physical strength for the needs of the schoolroom, which was revealed in their voices and faces. To my mind, the most serious of all possible defects in a teacher is a weak personality, in the sense in which this is generally understood, though I am aware it is quite indefinite. Pupils come into the school bringing with them usually impulses which have to be replaced by others of a higher character. They have to be won over from a certain kind of conduct to another of a quite different sort. When they are inside the school the old impulses seek inevitably to come to the front, and there is needed a power constantly acting which will noiselessly yet surely put a quietus upon these impulses and give encouragement to others of a more estimable kind. Now this power which must work in silent, unobtrusive, but yet effective, ways is the personality of the teacher; it will countenance certain kinds of conduct and condemn others; and what a powerful teacher regards with favor will thrive in the pupil's demeanor, and what he censures will lie dormant in the pupil's soul.

Of course this will be subconscious, but it will be none the less potent for good. If the personality of the teacher is not grander and stronger than that of his pupil the latter will hold his own course, right or wrong; he must touch some one whose mental and moral measure is outwardly and perceptibly greater than his before he will follow him as a leader. Static goodness (if there be such a thing) is not enough in a teacher; all his virtues must be dynamic; they must incessantly operate upon the social world and transform it. It is instructive to watch a boy among his adult acquaintances in daily life. Here is one that he tyrannizes over without let or scruple; here is another whom he serves as an abject slave; and he is probably never conscious of the reasons for his conduct. It is a subtle matter; a vigorous compelling personality incites to activity a certain group of emotions and impulses in the pupil's soul, while a different personality calls forth a very different group, and it all goes on in a subconscious, quiet way. Everywhere in the race one creature determines how it will conduct itself toward another by means of the signs presented in the voice, the face, the general bearing,

and the thing probably occurs more subtly in human life than anywhere else.

Our inspectors report another defect which is of a kind, in a way, with that mentioned above. They find teachers frequently who have at all times an imperious manner toward their pupils; they are sarcastic in their treatment of the weak and the halting; they never forgive, they cannot excuse failures, they will not be satisfied with anything less than the whole bond. A timid girl tries to answer the teacher's question, but gets confused and retires under a volley of criticism and abuse. These teachers miss no opportunity to rasp their pupils. They are always in a critical, fault-finding mood. One hardly ever hears them saying anything agreeable; they are everlastingly complaining and criticising. The result is, of course, that there is an unhappy relation existing all the time between instructor and student. Pupils get into the way of expecting something distressing to occur. The school in such hands becomes indeed a disciplinary institution. Truth is gained in such a place at considerable cost to good feeling and happiness on all sides. The road to learning if it is a royal one, is also an extremely thorny one.

We have reports of teachers who delight in harassing some particular pupil; and they are continually picking on the weak and defenseless, and those whom nature has cursed with some misfortune in body or mind. There seems to persist in them an old instinct which is often seen in animals—an instinct to torture creatures apparently for the pleasure of seeing them suffer. Is a pupil dull? then he must be put in mind of it every day and shamed before all his companions. Is he awkward? then he must be made gracious by ridicule. Is he timid? then the way to develop courage is to frighten him within an inch of his life every time he tries to recite. These teachers are conscientious enough. They believe in heroic measures in the training of the young; or rather they have no belief, they simply give away to the instincts that we have all inherited from a time when life was lived in a heroic way; when give and take was the law of the land—give as much as you can and take as little of things disagreeable, and the other way

round of things pleasant. Many a pupil is driven out of school from sheer fright of some monster in the teacher's chair. And a timid person will bear the scars in his soul all his life. I have had testimonies from persons who look back upon certain periods of their school life with regret and hatred, because their days were full of fear. Holmes evidently knew the type of pedagogue without sympathy or pity :

Grave is the master's look, his forehead wears  
 Thick rows of wrinkles, prints of worrying cares ;  
 Uneasy lie the heads of all that rule,  
 His worst of all whose kingdom is a school.  
 Supreme he sits ; before the awful frown  
 That binds his brow, the boldest eye goes down :  
 Not more submissive Israel heard and saw  
 At Sinai's foot the giver of the Law.

Pope knew him too, and he gives a picture of him in the *Greater Dunciad* :

When lo ! a spectre rose, whose index-hand  
 Held forth the virtue of the dreadful wand ;  
 His beavered brow the birchen garland wears,  
 Dropping with infants' blood, and mothers' tears.  
 O'er every vein a shuddering horror runs,  
 Eton and Winton shake through all their sons.

It seems doubtful if we can do much to determine what we call one's personality. It is probable that ninety-nine one-hundredths of one's make-up comes from heredity, and it is generally agreed that it is quite impossible to alter this appreciably. If nature has not endowed an individual with a strong and sympathetic personality it is probable that culture can do but little toward making him a fit guide for the young. Normal schools once thought they could make a teacher out of any kind of material, but they have learned from experience that they have overestimated their capacities. Some of the leading normal schools today, like Mr. Burk's in San Francisco, make it a business to select out very early those students that come to them that possess the natural traits for teaching, and all the rest they counsel to seek other fields of usefulness. And not until this plan is generally adopted by the universities will it be possible to turn into the secondary schools persons who can

teach in all that this implies. Our universities must facilitate natural selection instead of helping the unfit as well as the fit to survive.

It is clear enough that some of these most common defects in secondary-school teachers can be overcome in part at least, by a little rational instruction before candidates begin their work or while they are in the harness. But the instruction must be rational; defects are often reported which are due to mechanical instruction, which seeks to make a formal rule cover a great multitude of cases where the circumstances are not precisely the same. Such instruction gets the pupil conscious of the rule instead of the conditions existing before him, and as a result he makes a bad mess of it. Here is one teacher who has heard someone say that pupils ought always to get up to recite, and so she keeps at her flock day in and day out to elevate themselves whenever they say even as much as a single word. She wastes time in nagging at her pupils, and she arouses an unhappy and antagonistic attitude in them. They get to regard her and react to her as a vixen, as a termagant instead of a generous and genuine helper. Doubtless there are conditions under which a pupil ought to arise when he recites. If the class is a large one, those farthest away from the one reciting will not be apt to give their attention to what is going on unless they can see and hear the speaker, when this stimulus will aid them in holding their thought to what he says. Then when a class has been long sitting there is some physiological advantage in rising. Again, if a pupil is to speak for some time he can doubtless command himself better and speak with greater force if he arises. But precious time is wasted when pupils are jumping up continually, and it gets to be a mere matter of form with them which detracts from the spirit of the recitation. When the class is small and the teacher is in close spacial relation to them, a very much better spirit is engendered by the less formal method of recitation. For the teacher here to insist upon the pupil rising is to place form before substance; she really alienates instead of wins her class. Still again, when pupils are seated in a semi-circle, so that they can all see one another, the spirit of the class will

often be better for the pupil to recite sitting rather than standing. Once more, a timid pupil is easily embarrassed when he arises, and for him it would often be better to recite in the way in which he can do it with the least embarrassment. And there are other considerations which need not be mentioned; enough has been said to indicate that a teacher who gets hold of some maxim and tries to work it without studying the situation before her, without diagnosing it and getting at the root of the malady she would correct, is sure to make serious blunders and to teach rather like a machine than a living personality.

Here is another teacher who always insists on standing while she teaches. She says it is never good form for a teacher to sit. So she mortifies her flesh all day and usually she mortifies her students. Before the day is over she becomes fatigued, and no disease is more contagious than this. She grows cranky in her conscientiousness and drives her pupils from her. She makes it impossible also to add emphasis to certain phases in her teaching which need to be especially enforced, for if she were seated during the more quiet and intellectual part of her work, then when occasion demanded it she could arise and gain force thereby.

These instances are typical of many that I have come across showing that it is a dangerous thing to have a little knowledge in methods of teaching. In one schoolroom all spontaneity and freedom are abolished because it is a rule of pedagogy that everything must be done decently and soberly and in order. In another schoolroom everyone has all the freedom he wishes because it is a rule of pedagogy that one should not interfere with the rights of the young. The instructor in both cases is thinking about his rule and not about the conditions before him. In his eyes everything done outside the rules of the school should be put upon the same footing, whether it is in harmony with the general spirit of the school or opposed to it. In his displeasure at a student he administers penalties because a rule that he made has been broken. He does not see the necessity of finding out whether the pupil's act really interfered with the well-being of the school, or whether he deliberately broke



some intrinsic law of the school. The *rule* must be enforced. But a teacher who studies schoolroom situations instead of rules would have only the general aims of the school in view, and would then interpret the individual case before her in the light of this general aim, and the tendency of human nature. He would not take the stand that if a certain method of dealing with pupils did not work the fault lay with the pupils, and he would keep at it until the bitter end. He would realize that the school exists to accomplish certain ends, and methods are good or bad according as they assist or hinder in this end. What may be good with one class of pupils under one set of conditions and with one kind of a teacher may be extremely bad with another class of pupils under a different set of conditions and with a teacher of different personal qualities. So that teacher alone is going to succeed who has been gotten into the way of studying schoolroom situations and interpreting them in the light of principles of human nature; the teacher who keeps his mind on rules and works by rule will miss the mark a good part of the time.

Perhaps I have dwelt too long upon the dark side of teaching; I have left myself space to say but a word before closing regarding the brighter side. Our reports make the "power of holding interest" the cardinal virtue in secondary teaching. A teacher is rated high or low according as she possesses this quality in high or low degree. And it is easy to see why this should be a just standard of measurement; for to gain the continuous interest of pupils requires that the instructor should do the thing that ought to be done for them. Interest is the thermometer of live teaching; it shows the warmth generated by one's instruction, thus indicating whether the pupil is having a real and vital experience in the way in which it touches his springs of conduct. When a class is continually interested it implies that the instructor not only knows perfectly what he is teaching, but he also possesses personal qualities which win the confidence and esteem and good will of his pupils. In fine, when a class is all aglow with interest it shows that everything must be working harmoniously toward the one great end of giving pupils a better

understanding of and so a more complete mastery over their environments.

Of course the interest reported by our inspectors is not of a temporary or trivial character; it will not be confused with whim or fancy or caprice or anything of the kind. The pupil is simply *en rapport* with his subject; he is making it his own, and in doing this he assumes the relation toward it that we call interest. It is true that all good teachers sometimes make use of adventitious means to arouse the pupil's feelings and to give him some points of contact with his subject. The Shakespeare teacher organizes a Shakesperean club. He takes his pupils to the opera. He has them dramatize a play themselves. The teacher of French has a French club that meets outside of school where French is the language used; French stories are read and French life simulated. And in other cases teachers have a sense of humor which they employ advantageously in the school-room, thus endowing things intrinsically dull with a certain mellow feeling. These teachers know how to appeal to the funny sense at just the right moment, so that pupils will feel that their pleasure comes from the performance of tasks instead of in some circuitous way, and thus they are pleasantly helped over hard places.

Of course, no teacher can make her work of interest who is not absolutely master of the subject she teaches; she must be full of it, and overflowing. She must be able to anticipate the difficulties of her pupils because she herself has worked over every step of the ground, and looked at the whole from a point far beyond that which the pupil now occupies. "She brings so much to her class" it is said, so much that it illumines the thing in hand, clarifies it, unites it with other experiences and interests in the pupil's life. She knows quotations that bear upon the topic in hand; in short, she knows her subject. And this inclines her pupils happily toward her work. We all want to get help from those who can render us assistance, but we protest, whether consciously or not, against wasting time over those who have no more knowledge or skill than we have. Absolute accuracy as well as fulness of knowledge is essential to continuously com-

mand the confidence and respect of pupils. If they do not feel this mastership they lose their respect for the instructor, and all the most estimable qualities of character cannot overcome this feeling of distrust. Again, the teacher who holds the interest of all her pupils must be a past master in the art of questioning; she must know how to arrange her pupils so as to keep them in vital contact with her throughout the recitation; she must know how to deal wisely with individuals, stimulating the lethargic, reassuring the timid, and exercising patience with the weak. She must have an active sense of good fellowship so that she can appeal to all the profound emotions that ally people together and that do not have a chance ordinarily to express themselves in the formal work in Latin, or algebra, or physics. The pupil's life is a good deal larger than can be compassed within the subject in which he is reciting at any moment, and the great teacher will guide this over-life as well as that which is directly involved in the work in hand.

M. V. O'SHEA.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.